



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

3J

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/437,278      | 11/10/1999  | WILLIAM J. DONOVAN   | 33-99-001           | 7771             |

5073 7590 04/23/2003

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
2001 ROSS AVENUE  
SUITE 600  
DALLAS, TX 75201-2980

EXAMINER

PORTER, RACHEL L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3626

DATE MAILED: 04/23/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|                              |                        |                     |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b> | <b>Applicant(s)</b> |
|                              | 09/437,278             | DONOVAN ET AL.      |
|                              | <b>Examiner</b>        | <b>Art Unit</b>     |
|                              | Rachel L. Porter       | 3626                |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 January 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 2-4,7,8,10,11,14-20 and 24-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 2-4,7,8,10,11,14-20 and 24-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                    | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)           | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                                   |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Notice to the Applicant***

1. This communication is in response to the amendment filed 1/30/03. Claims 2-4, 7,8,10,11,14-20, and 24-30 are pending. Claims 2-4, 7,10,11,14-20 have been amended. Claims 24-30 are new.

### ***Specification***

2. The objection to the specification raised in the previous Office Action is hereby withdrawn due to the amendment filed 1/30/03.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The rejection of claims 1-4, 6-11, and 13-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification, is hereby withdrawn due to the amendment filed 1/30/03.

### ***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 2-4, 7-8,10-11, 14-20 and 24-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 3,14,16, 24-25 and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hunt et al (USPN 5,842,17—referred to hereinafter as Hunt) in view of Official Notice.

As per claim 24, Hunt teaches a travel pricing system, comprising:

- a data store; and (Figures 1and 2; col. 4, lines 11-32—client computer)
- a server coupled to the data store, the server: (Figures 1 and 2; col. 4, lines 11-32—server (14)
  - o receiving a first reservation record relating to a first type of record, the first reservation record comprising travel attributes, the travel attributes arranged in a first record format; (col. 3, line 59- col. 4, line 10; col. 4, line 65-col. 5, line 5; col. 5, lines 25-35—The system server receives datasets from one or more reservation systems. The pass through mode allows the data to be received in the original code of the source system, without normalization/reformatting.)
  - o adding the first reservation record to the data store using the first reservation record format; (col. 4,lines 59-col. 5, line 5; col. 6, lines 55-64—System returns datasets (i.e. records) from the CRS's to the requesting client)
  - o receiving a second reservation record relating to the first type of record, the second reservation record comprising at least a portion of the travel attributes associated with the first reservation record (Figures 1; col. 2,

lines 48-55; col. 3, line 59- col. 4, line 4 —Datasets are returned from one or more reservation systems in the standard code language (i.e. format) of the source CRS without reformatting or normalization. Each CRS uses different code languages (i.e. different formats). Also, the datasets relate to a search for travel reservations for a particular customer and therefore contain similar data (same travel dates, origins/destinations, seat availability on various airlines) as returned from the different CRS's. (col. 6, lines 9-50). Thus the second reservation record relates to the first record type.)

- adding the second reservation record to the data store using the second reservation record format. (col. 4, lines 59-col. 5, line 5; col. 6, lines 55-64; col. 8, lines 42-58—System returns datasets (i.e. records) from the CRS's to the requesting client.)

Hunt discloses receiving reservation data from a plurality of sources (i.e. CRS's) in response to a user's query for desired travel accommodations (col. 6, lines 4-50), but does not expressly disclose the use of timestamps and version numbers. However, it is respectfully submitted that associating computer files/records with timestamps and version numbers is old and well known in the art. For example, Cabrera et al (USPN 6,189,016) discloses a system wherein data records are associated with both timestamps and version numbers (col. 5, lines 35-54). At the time of the Applicant's invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teaching of Hunt to associate the different datasets returned to the client with distinct

Art Unit: 3626

version numbers and timestamps. One would have been motivated to do this to assist the user in determining the age and validity of the data that is used to arrange travel for a customer and also to provide a more efficient and powerful approach to tracking changes or updates made to the storage volume in a computer system, as suggested by Cabrera. (col. 2, lines 1-4)

As per claim 3, Hunt teaches the system of claim 24, wherein the second reservation record comprises travel reservation data associated with a city pair. (col. 6, lines 9-16).

As per claim 25, the limitations of the present claim substantially duplicate of the limitations of claim 24, with its first and second reservation data records, first and second data formats, timestamps and version numbers. Claim 25 recites differs in that it recites an additional (i.e. third) reservation record with a version number, and a third format, and further recites that the reservation data relates to the second reservation record. Since, the courts have broadly held that the duplication of parts/steps is obvious *In re Harza*, 274 F.2d 669, 124 USPQ 378 (CCPA 1960), it is respectfully submitted that these changes do not present a patentable distinction over the applied prior art of record. The limitations of claim 24 have been shown to be obvious over the system disclosed by Hunt, which accommodates reservation data records with multiple formats and in which the data from the records are associated with one another. Claim 25 is rejected for the same reasons provided in the rejection of claim 24 and incorporated herein.

As per claim 29, Hunt discloses a method for organizing travel reservation data, comprising:

- receiving a first reservation record relating to a first type of record, the first reservation record comprising travel attributes, the travel attributes arranged in a first record format; (col. 3, line 59- col. 4, line 10; col. 4, line 65-col. 5, line 5; col. 5, lines 25-35—The system server receives datasets from one or more reservation systems. The pass through mode allows the data to be received in the original code of the source system , without normalization/reformatting.)
- adding the first reservation record to the data store using the first reservation record format; (col. 4,lines 59-col. 5, line 5; col. 6, lines 55-64—System returns datasets (i.e. records) from the CRS's to the requesting client)
- receiving a second reservation record relating to the first type of record, the second reservation record comprising at least a portion of the travel attributes associated with the first reservation record (Figures 1; col. 2, lines 48-55; col. 3, line 59- col. 4, line 4—Datasets are returned from one or more reservation systems in the standard code language (i.e. format) of the source CRS without reformatting or normalization. Each CRS uses different code languages (i.e. different formats). Also, the datasets relate to a search for travel reservations for a particular customer and therefore contain similar data (same travel dates, origins/destinations, seat availability on various

- airlines) as returned from the different CRS's. (col. 6, lines 9-50). Thus the second reservation record relates to the first record type.)
- adding the second reservation record to the data store using the second reservation record format. (col. 4, lines 59-col. 5, line 5; col. 6, lines 55-64; col. 8, lines 42-58—System returns datasets (i.e. records) from the CRS's to the requesting client.)

Hunt discloses receiving reservation data from a plurality of sources (i.e. CRS's) in response to a user's query for desired travel accommodations. (col. 6, lines 4-50), but does not expressly disclose the use of timestamps and version numbers. However, it is respectfully submitted that associating computer files/records with timestamps and version numbers is old and well known in the art. For example, Cabrera et al (USPN 6,189,016) teaches a system wherein data records are associated with both timestamps and version numbers (col. 5, lines 35-54). At the time of the Applicant's invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teaching of Hunt to associate the different datasets returned to the client with distinct version numbers and timestamps. One would have been motivated to do this to assist the user in determining the age and validity of the data that is used to arrange travel for a customer and also to provide a more efficient and powerful approach to tracking changes or updates made to the storage volume in a computer system, as suggested by Cabrera. (col. 2, lines 1-4)

As per claim 14, Hunt teaches a method wherein the first reservation record and the second reservation record each comprise travel reservation data associated with a city pair. (col. 6, lines 9-16)

As per claim 16, Hunt teaches the method and system for retrieving and processing data with multiple data formats, (col. 5, lines 24-col. 6, lines 16), but does not specifically disclose the details of how the system processes the different formats of the reservation records. However, it is respectfully submitted that the use of Prolog is old and well known in the computer arts. At the time of the Applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system/method of Hunt so that the data is processed using Prolog. One would have been motivated to do this to facilitate the travel agent's ability to sort through vast amounts of travel data from disparate sources in an efficient manner and to better serve the customer by making better use of available resources. (Hunt, col. 2, lines 1-10; col. 2, lines 32-47)

As per claim 30, the limitations of the present claim substantially duplicate of the limitations of claim 29, with its first and second reservation data records, first and second data formats, timestamps and version numbers. Claim 30 differs in that it recites an additional (i.e. third) reservation record with a version number, and a third format, and further recites that the reservation data relates to the second reservation record. Since, the courts have broadly held that the duplication of parts/steps is obvious *In re Harza*, 274 F.2d 669, 124 USPQ 378 (CCPA 1960), it is respectfully submitted that these changes do not present a patentable distinction over the applied prior art of record. The limitations of claim 29 have been shown to be obvious over the

system disclosed by Hunt, which accommodates reservation data records with multiple formats and in which the data from the records are associated with one another. Claim 30 is rejected for the same reasons provided in the rejection of claim 29 and incorporated herein.

7. Claims 7,8,10,11 and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hunt et al (USPN 5,842,17—referred to hereinafter as Hunt) in view of Official Notice, as applied to claim 24, and in further view of Webber et al (USPN 5,331,546-referred to hereinafter as Webber) and Barney et al (USPN 6,212,512-referred to hereinafter as Barney).

As per claim 26, the limitations of the present claim are substantially similar to those recited in claim 24. As such, these limitations are addressed by the rejection of claim 24 and incorporated herein. Claim 26 differs from claim 24 in that it specifically recites that the reservation data in the first and second reservation records comprises old and new fare data associated with a city pair. Hunt teaches a system for retrieving travel reservation data as explained in the rejection of claim 24, but does not expressly disclose that the reservation records comprise fare data associated with a city pair. However, Hunt does disclose that the system may accommodate any type of reservation data that may be received from a CRS. (col. 8, lines 26-30) Webber teaches a system that retrieves reservation record data wherein the data includes fare data associated with a city pair. (col. 3,lines 19-35; col. 5, lines 51-65; col. 8,lines 3-13) The tariff files contains fare information associated with travel origins and destinations (i.e. city pairs). Moreover, the tariff file is updated regularly, yielding old and new fare

data. At the time of the Applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Hunt with the teaching of Webber to include fare data among the types of data obtained from the CRS queries. As suggested by Webber and Hunt, one would have been motivated to do this to simplify the travel arranging process for travel agents, by allowing them to rapidly sift through vast amounts of itinerary data to identify least costly travel options that comply with the customer's requirements. (Webber: col. 1, line 60-col. 2, line 10)

Claim 26 also differs from claim 24 in that it recites that the first and second files are added/appended to the data store by flat file and are chronologically arranged by using the time stamp. Hunt and Webber do not expressly disclose that adding files to a data store by flat file appendage or chronological arranging files by timestamp. Barney discloses a system wherein the files may be chronologically arranged by time stamp (Figure 4; col. 3,lines 5-24; col. 9, line 48-col. 10, line 48). The system allows users to view files in the data vault by various criteria, including dates creation and modification dates. Barney further discloses that the addition of files to a data store by flat file (i.e. flat file appendage) is well known in the art. (col. 3, lines 18-24) At the time of the Applicant's invention, it would have would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Hunt and Webber with the teaching of Barney to allow files to be added to the data store by flat file and to allow the files to be chronologically arranged (by timestamp). One would have been motivated to do this to facilitate the storage and retrieval of the desired information according to user preferences. (Barney: col. 8, lines 5-63)

As per claim 7, Hunt teaches a system for retrieving travel data and adding that data to a data store, but does not specifically disclose that the reservation data comprises fare data associated with a service provider. However, Hunt does disclose that the reservation data may include any type of data that may be obtained from a CRS. (col. 8, line 23-29) Webber teaches a system wherein the reservation record data includes fare data associated a particular service provider. (col. 3,lines 19-35, 49-64; col. 5, lines 51-65; col. 8,lines 3-13) At the time of the Applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Hunt with the teaching of Webber to include fare data associated with a service provider among the types of data obtained from the CRS queries. As suggested by Webber and Hunt, one would have been motivated to do this to simplify the travel arranging process for travel agents by allowing them to access and process vast amounts of itinerary data to identify appropriate, least costly travel options that comply with the customer's requirements. (Webber: col. 1, line 60-col. 2, line 10)

As per claims 8 and 10, Hunt and Webber in combination teach a system of obtaining travel reservation data that including information on city pairs and carriers, but do not specifically disclose how the data is indexed (by which parameters the data is indexed). Barney teaches a system which allows the user to view (i.e. index) data according to a variety of parameters. (Figure 4, col. 3, lines 5-63; col. col. 10, lines 4-49) At the time of the Applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Hunt and Webber in combination with the teaching of Barney to index the reservation data files by city pair or by both city pair and

carrier. As suggested by Barney, one would have been motivated to index the data using various attributes of the data (i.e. city pair or city pair and carrier) so that the system's users could easily customize the organization and retrieval of the stored data files to suit individual preferences. (col. 3, lines 5-24)

As per claim 11, Hunt, Webber, and Barney in combination teach a system of claim 26 as explained in the rejection of claim 26. Hunt does not specifically disclose a time stamp that includes an activation stamp that indicates when the server can initially use the second reservation record. Webber discloses that that the reservation data includes a rule file includes a rule file that contains restrictions governing the use of particular fares (i.e. including dates indicating when the reservation data can be used). At the time of the Applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Hunt with the teaching of Webber to include an activation stamp that notifies the server when that reservation data is valid. As suggested by Webber, one would have been motivated to do this to make certain that the disclosed system applies correct, date-appropriate guidelines and effective/active travel data when assessing whether certain travel options are available and comply with corporate travel policies and individual traveler preferences. (col. 4, lines 19-50)

As per claim 27, Hunt teaches a system for retrieving reservation data and adding that data to a data store, but does not specifically disclose that the first and second data includes rule data relating to a city pair. However, Hunt does disclose that the reservation data may include various types of travel data. (col. 8, lines 23-30) Webber discloses a system wherein the system repeatedly retrieves reservation data

Art Unit: 3626

comprising updates of rule data associated with a city pair. (col. 3, lines 49-64). At the time of the Applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Hunt with the teaching of Webber, to have the reservation data include multiple sets of rule data associated with a city pair. One would have been motivated to do this to ensure that the travel agent has access to comprehensive information necessary to make valid travel arrangements according the customer's preferences.

Hunt and Webber in combination teach adding reservation data in different formats to a data store, but do not expressly disclose that the second rule set data are added without modifying the attributes of the first (i.e. versioning). Barney teaches a method wherein multiple copies/versions of a record are added to a data store without modifying the previous version/copy of that file. (col. 9, line 48-col. 10, line 3). At the time of the Applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the combination of Hunt and Webber with the teaching of Barney to allow multiple copies/versions of an updated rule file to be added without modifying the previous versions of the rule data. One would have been motivated to do this to ensure that the travel arranger/agent has access to a complete set of the travel data necessary to make valid arrangements according the customer's preferences.

As per claim 28, the limitations of the present claim substantially duplicate of the limitations of claim 26, with its first and second reservation data records, first and second data formats, timestamps and version numbers. Claim 28 differs in that it recites an additional (i.e. third) reservation record with a version number, and a third

format, and further recites that the reservation data relates to the second reservation record. Since, the courts have broadly held that the duplication of parts/steps is obvious *In re Harza*, 274 F.2d 669, 124 USPQ 378 (CCPA 1960), it is respectfully submitted that these changes do not present a patentable distinction over the applied prior art of record. The limitations of claim 26 have been shown to be obvious over the system disclosed by Hunt, Webber and Barney in combination, which accommodate reservation data records with multiple formats and in which the data from the records are associated with one another. Claim 28 is rejected for the same reasons provided in the rejection of claim 26 and incorporated herein.

8. Claims 2, 4, 15, and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hunt and Official Notice as applied to claims 24 and 29, in further view of Barney.

As per claim 2, Hunt teaches the system of claim 24, as explained in the rejection of claim 24, but does not specifically disclose that the first reservation record and the second reservation record are added to the data store by appendage into a flat file. Barney discloses that the addition of files to a data store by flat file (i.e. flat file appendage) is well known in the art. (col. 3, lines 18-24) At the time of the Applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Hunt with the teaching of Barney to allow files to be added to the data store by flat file. One would have been motivated to do this to facilitate the storage and retrieval of the desired information according to user preferences. (Barney: col. 3, lines 5-44)

As per claim 4, Hunt teaches a system for retrieving reservation data and for adding the reservation to a data store, but does not specifically disclose the use of a timestamp as the key to the data store. (col. 4,lines 59-col. 5, line 5; col. 6, lines 55-64; col. 8, lines 42-58) Barney teaches a system, wherein the records are added to the data store by using the time stamp as a key into a database. (Figure 4; col. 3,lines 5-24; col. 9, line 48-col. 10, line 48). The system allows users to view files in the data vault by various criteria, including dates creation and modification dates (timestamps). At the time of the Applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Hunt with the teaching of Barney to allow the timestamp to be used as the key to storing and/or retrieving the records. As suggested by Barney, one would have been motivated to do this to make it easier to identify, arrange, and retrieve the (reservation) data from the data store according the preferences and needs of the user. (Barney: col. 3, lines 5-52)

As per claim 15, the limitations of this claim are addressed by the rejection of claims 4 and 29 and incorporated herein.

As per claim 17, Hunt discloses the method of claim 29 as explained in the rejection of claim 29, but does not specifically disclose that the first reservation record and the second reservation record are added into the data store by appendage into a flat file chronologically using the time stamp. Barney discloses a system wherein the files may be chronologically arranged by time stamp (Figure 4; col. 3,lines 5-24; col. 9, line 48-col. 10, line 48). The system allows users to view files in the data vault by various criteria, including dates creation and modification dates. Barney further

discloses that the addition of files to a data store by flat file (i.e. flat file appendage) is well known in the art. (col. 3, lines 18-24) At the time of the Applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Hunt with the teaching of Barney to allow files to be added to the data store by flat file and to allow the files to be chronologically arranged (by timestamp). One would have been motivated to do this to facilitate the storage and retrieval of the desired information according to user preferences. (Barney: col. 8, lines 5-63)

As per claim 18, Hunt teaches a system of retrieving reservation data from one or more sources and adding this data to a data store as explained in the rejection of claim 29, but does not specifically disclose synchronizing the data with an additional server. Barney teaches a system of synchronizing the files/records with across multiple data storage units (i.e. an additional server). (Figures 9A-B; 13B; col. 3, lines 54-63; col. 14, line 35-col. 15, line 15; col. 16, line 56-col. 18, line 32) The system allows users to check copies of records across various data stores and to copy the same version of these files across the various data stores. At the time of the Applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Hunt with the teaching of Barney to allow the files (i.e. the second reservation data file) to be synchronized with an additional server. As suggested by Barney, one would have been motivated to do this to provide a simple and efficient method for protecting system data. (col. 1, line 65- col. 2, line 14)

As per claim 19, Hunt teaches a method of retrieving and storing travel reservation data that including information on city pairs (col. 6, lines 9-16), but does not

specifically disclose how the data is indexed (by which parameters the data is indexed). Barney teaches a system which allows the user to view (i.e. index) data according to a variety of parameters. (Figure 4, col. 3, lines 5-63; col. col. 10, lines 4-49) At the time of the Applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Hunt with the teaching of Barney to index the reservation data files by city pair or by both city pair. As suggested by Barney, one would have been motivated to index the data using various attributes of the data (i.e. city pair or city pair and carrier) so that the system's users could easily customize the organization and retrieval of the stored data files to suit individual preferences. (col. 3, lines 5-24)

9. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hunt and Official Notice as applied to claims 24 and 29, and in further view of Webber.

As per claim 20, Hunt teaches the method of claim 29, as explained in the rejection of claim 29. Hunt does not explicitly disclose that the reservation data attributes comprise one selected from the group consisting of fares associated with a service provider, rules associated with the service provider, and restrictions associated with the service provider. However, Hunt does disclose that the reservation data may include any type of data that may be obtained from a CRS. (col. 8, line 23-29) Webber teaches a method wherein the reservation record data includes fare data associated a particular service provider or rule data. (col. 3,lines 19-35, 49-64; col. 5, lines 51-65; col. 8,lines 3-13) At the time of the Applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Hunt with the teaching of Webber to include fare data or rule data among the types of data obtained from the CRS

queries. As suggested by Webber and Hunt, one would have been motivated to do this to simplify the travel arranging process for travel agents by allowing them to access and process vast amounts of itinerary data to identify least costly travel options that comply with the customer's requirements. (Webber: col. 1, line 60-col. 2, line 10)

### ***Conclusion***

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Bohannon et al (USPN 6,125,371) teaches a system for storing multiple versions of the data record in a data store.
- Cabrera et al (USPN 6,189,016) teaches a system for recording changes made to specific data files.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rachel L. Porter whose telephone number is 703-305-0108. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Thomas can be reached on (703)305-9588. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)305-7687 for regular communications and (703)305-7687 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 3626

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-1113.

RP

RP

April 21, 2003

  
JOSEPH THOMAS  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600